

REMARKS

35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-5, 6, 8, 10, 20, 24, and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hueting et al. (WO/01/69684 A2).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-5, 6, 8, 10, 20, 24, and 26-28. The field-effect transistor of claim 1 includes a control region arranged in the first depression. Claim 1 further recites that the field-effect transistor includes “*only one* depression in which the control region is arranged”. The office action asserts that the region 11 of Hueting (see Fig. 1) arranged in depression 20 corresponds to the claimed control region arranged in the first depression. Applicant respectfully submits that the side-by-side cells shown in Fig. 1 (showing two depressions 20, each including a region 11) are part of a single field-effect transistor (see Hueting, page 2, lines 4-12). Further, the field-effect transistor of Hueting includes multiple parallel cells and thus, depressions, in which a control region is arranged (see Hueting, page 7, lines 25-32; Fig. 3). Hueting does not teach or suggest a field effect transistor including only one depression in which the control region is arranged.

Claim 1 also shows that the field-effect transistor is a drive transistor at a word line or at a bit line of a memory cell array. Hueting does not relate to a memory cell array.

For the foregoing reasons, Hueting does not disclose all the features of claims 1-5, 6, 8, 10, 20, 24, and 26-28. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 9 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hueting et al. (WO/01/69684 A2), and further in view of Degawa et al. (EP 0872895).

Claims 9 and 25 each ultimately depend from claim 1. As noted above, Hueting does not disclose all the features of claim 1. Degawa does not cure this deficiency. Degawa is relied to disclose a depression between the field-effect transistor and an

adjacent electronic component that has a larger depth than the depression for the control region, as well as comparable widths between two depressions of the field-effect transistor. The combination of Hueting and Degawa does not disclose all the features of claim 1, or the claims that depend from claim 1, including claims 9 and 25.

For the reasons discussed above, the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the pending claims of the application. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of the Final Rejection and that a Notice of Allowance be issued in the present case. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned in the event that a telephone interview would expedite consideration of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Rickard K. DeMille, Reg. No. 58,471/
Rickard K. DeMille
Registration No. 58,471
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200